

Please note that there is a difference between:

- a) The eye consciousness apprehending **the reflection of a face in a mirror** and
- b) The eye consciousness apprehending **the reflection of a face to be an actual face**.

Both are mistaken with respect to the object of appearance and thus are mistaken awarenesses but only one of them is a wrong consciousness.

All awarenesses have at least two objects:

- 1. An appearing object
- 2. An object of engagement (or) object of apprehension

A mistaken consciousness is an awareness that is mistaken with respect to its *appearing object*. A wrong consciousness is an awareness that is mistaken with respect to its *object of engagement*.

a) The eye consciousness apprehending the reflection of a face in a mirror:

Regarding the eye consciousness apprehending **the reflection of a face in a mirror**, its object of engagement is **the reflection of a face in a mirror** because **the reflection of a face in a mirror** is its *main* object. Thus, **the reflection of a face in a mirror** is the object that the eye consciousness apprehends and engages in. Since **the reflection of a face in a mirror** exists, that eye consciousness is not mistaken with respect to its object of engagement.

However, to that eye consciousness **the reflection of a face in a mirror** appears **to be an actual face** so that **the reflection of a face in a mirror being an actual face** is the appearing object. Since **the reflection of a face in a mirror being an actual face** does not exist, that eye consciousness is mistaken with respect to its appearing object.

Furthermore, that eye consciousness arises in the continua of those who have understood that **the reflection of a face in a mirror** is not an actual face.

It is taken as an example for illustrating how we can have correct consciousnesses, i.e. valid cognizers, which understand and apprehend their main objects correctly while at the same time are mistaken with respect to their appearing objects. They are mistaken regarding their appearing objects because their objects appear to exist inherently/truly. Even after one has directly realized the emptiness of inherent existence that appearance remains until one reaches the state of a Buddha.

b) An eye consciousness apprehending the reflection of a face to be an actual face:

Regarding the eye consciousness apprehending **the reflection of a face to be an actual face**, its object of engagement is **the reflection of a face being an actual face** because **the reflection of a face in a mirror being an actual face** is its *main* object. Thus, **the reflection of a face in a mirror being an actual face** is the object that the eye consciousness apprehends and engages in. Since **the reflection of a face in a mirror being an actual face** does not exist, that eye consciousness is mistaken with respect to its object of engagement.

Moreover, to that eye consciousness **the reflection of a face in a mirror being an actual face** appears so that **the reflection of a face in a mirror being an actual face** is the appearing object. Since **the reflection of a face in a mirror being an actual face** does not exist, that eye consciousness is also mistaken with respect to its appearing object.

That eye consciousness arises in the continua of those who have not learned yet that **the reflection of a face in a mirror** is not an actual face.

It is taken as an example for explaining the ignorance that actively apprehends that phenomena exist inherently/truly. Thus, such ignorance is a *wrong* consciousness because it is mistaken regarding its object of engagement (phenomena existing inherently/truly). At the same time it is also a *mistaken* consciousness because it is mistaken with respect to its object of appearance (phenomena existing inherently/truly).

Therefore, if an awareness is a mistaken consciousness (mistaken with regard to its appearing object) it is not necessarily a wrong consciousness (mistaken with regard to its object of engagement). However if it is a wrong consciousness (mistaken with regard to its object of engagement) it is necessarily also a mistaken consciousness (mistaken with regard to its appearing object).

RELATING THAT TO THE ACTUAL CONTEXT

In Chandrakirti's *Supplement to the Middle Way* the topic of the *Two Truths* is a topic that branches off from another topic, i.e. the refutation of an impermanent phenomenon being **produced by inherently existing other** (causes). This in turn is refuted in the context of the following syllogism:

The subject **the sprout**, it is **not inherently produced** because (1) of **not being produced by itself**, (2) **not being produced by inherently existing other** (causes), (3) **not being produced by both** (by itself and inherently existent other causes) and (4) **not being produced causelessly**.

More specifically, Chandrakirti elucidates the topic of the *Two Truths* in order to dispel wrong views. One of those wrong view is the assertion that the **production by inherently existent other** (causes) cannot be refuted because worldly beings' valid cognizers '*realize*' that inherently existent effects arise from inherently existent other causes. Thus, according to this mistaken view, the refutation of **production by inherently existent other** (causes) is not possible, for it is damaged or invalidated by the common sense perceptions of worldly beings.

In the context of expounding on the *Two Truths* Chandrakirti explained during the previous sections that even though all conventional truths are deceptive and thus unreal, there is a division of deceptive objects into true and unreal objects *relative to the perspective of the world*. This division is made by relying on conventional valid consciousnesses in the continua of worldly beings who have never taken emptiness to mind. Those worldly beings' valid cognizers are able to differentiate correctly between the objects that are true and unreal *from a worldly perspective*. Thereby those cognizers are also able to identify objects that do not exist even conventionally - with the exception of the object of negation of emptiness, i.e. inherent existence.

During the present section, **RELATING THAT TO THE ACTUAL CONTEXT**, Chandrakirti relates what was explained previously (in the preceding paragraph) to the actual context of dispelling the wrong view that denies the validity of refuting **the production by inherently existent other** (causes):

Lama Tsongkhapa says that in order to understand suchness (the ultimate truth) one does not rely on conventional valid cognizers. Therefore, in order to refute '**production by other**' one does not merely rely on worldly perception but on the realization of Arya beings, for one actually refutes **production by inherently existent other** (causes).

Furthermore, Chandrakirti says in his *Supplement to the Middle Way*:

*What is observed by someone with an eye disease
Cannot invalidate what someone sees who is free of such eye disease.
Likewise, a mind lacking immaculate wisdom
Cannot invalidate an awareness that is immaculate.*

Thus, Chandrakirti gives the example of someone who is not able to see properly due to an eye disease. The eye consciousness of the person who suffers from that eye disease cannot invalidate what the person sees who does not suffer from such disease and has good eyesight. Likewise, an awareness that is affected by ignorance and is mistaken with regard to the real nature of phenomena cannot invalidate the immaculate wisdom that realizes the ultimate nature, i.e. the emptiness of inherent existence of all phenomena.

Therefore, even though worldly beings' awarenesses apprehend that inherently existent effects are produced by inherently existent other causes, they are wrong consciousnesses and cannot invalidate the wisdom that realizes the lack of '**production by other**', i.e. that refutes the lack of an impermanent phenomenon being **produced by inherently existent other** (causes).

Furthermore, the refutation of '**production by other**' on an ultimate level is not undermined by asserting the '**production by other** (causes)' *relative to the perspective of the world*, i.e. if one asserts that impermanent phenomena are produced by *conventionally existent* other causes.

Please note that here 'other causes' means that a cause is other than or a different entity/nature from its effect. For instance, the sprout is the effect of the seed. Therefore, the seed and the sprout are a different entity or nature.

